



## **Trans-Lake Washington Project**

Washington State  
Department of Transportation  
Sound Transit

## **Public Input For Weeks of February 5 to 16, 2001**

**Date of Comment:** February 8, 2001

**Subjects:** Alternatives, impacts, mitigation/enhancements, general-purpose lane, transit, HOV lane, bicycle/pedestrian lane, interchanges, and entrance lanes.

**Comment:** To: Executive and Advisory Committees, Trans Lake Study  
Sub: Response to Mac Isaacs-Wasserman proposal of February 6, 2001

**SUMMARY:** While this proposal contains some very interesting conceptual ideas, it fails the test of regional benefit. As written, the proposal burdens Montlake and NE Seattle commuters to downtown (of which there are many) while benefiting EB east side commuters to downtown owing to a diminished impact of SR 520 westbound traffic at I-5. On the other hand, the concept of HOV-only ramps along all of SR 520, when coupled with effective transit alternatives to major peak-hour destinations holds considerable promise for future regional benefit. Other short-term steps might also be considered.

### **CRITICISM**

- \* Since I bike to work I won't claim expertise about problems at SR 520 and Montlake Blvd. But I don't think that you need to be an expert to notice that WB traffic on SR 520 from Montlake interchange to I-5 is generally in good shape each morning. That's because congestion further east meters the flow of vehicles on WB SR 520 at Montlake. Why shouldn't City residents use the roadway? I doubt if SR 520 was built for the exclusive use of suburban commuters.
- \* SR 520 between Montlake and I-5 needs very costly seismic retrofitting whether it is widened or not. So little is to be saved by treating this short section any differently than the rest of SR 520 in regional planning.
- \* Removal of the ramp-metering signal from Montlake to EB SR 520 would not have much impact on Montlake congestion since (according to WSDOT) this light prevents SR 520 from paralysis with much the same congestion on Montlake.
- \* It is unfair and pejorative to assert that Seattle residents are using SR 520 as a mere arterial to I-5, as if that's evil. I-5 isn't their destination; it's their route to go somewhere else. I don't suppose that Kirkland or Bellevue residents hop on and off SR 520 to access I-405 in order to get around town or to go to Bellevue Square. Same thing.

Frankly, ramps shouldn't be HOV-only until effective alternatives to SOVs are in place. For example, when NE Seattle residents commuting to downtown have the option of express public

transit service, then a step to encouraging rider ship would be to restrict use of the Montlake on and off ramps. Ditto on 108th in Kirkland.

## CONCLUSION

Restricting the ramps shouldn't be the carrot. They should be the stick. Mac I/W should be proposing to provide express transit service to Seattle from all interchanges along SR 520. Once the high-efficiency system is in place -- only then -- convert all of the SR 520 on and off ramps and one or more lanes of SR 520 to exclusive HOV use. That will benefit the entire region.

In the short term, large businesses (e.g., Microsoft or Boeing) and important commuter destinations (e.g., University of Washington) should consider serving as peak-hour park-and-ride lots for one another's commuters once point-to-point bus express bus service is provided. This is a concept with straightforward implementation (e.g., no construction) and potential regional benefit.

cc: Jeff Peacock

---

**Date of Comment:** February 13, 2001

**Subjects:** HCT

**Comment:** One word says it all- MONORAIL

---

**Date of Comment:** February 14, 2001

**Subjects:** Project

**Comment:** I have before me at least two very different "2001 Public Meeting Schedules," one listing meetings at the end of February, the other none. Please post the definitive and final schedule A.S.A.P. Thank you.

---

**Date of Comment:** February 14, 2001

**Subjects:** Project

**Summary of Comment:** Would like more information and to be added to mailing list

---

**Date of Comment:** February 14, 2001

**Subjects:** Impacts and project

**Comment:** New to area—considering buying a home at East Roanoke and Lake Washington Boulevard East (near ramps)—would like information on current thinking (call him).

---